

*Immigration Act, 1976*

continue to reinforce some of the statements he made during his intervention on Friday. I see that I was mistaken. He brought to our attention today his deeply held conviction that the fifth report of the standing committee is not incorporated in Bill C-55.

I went over it again on the weekend and find in it time after time after time recommendations of the committee, or in some cases Rabbi Plaut's recommendations, over those of the committee. Bill C-55 is built upon the Plaut report and the committee's report.

For people to stand up in this House and say that anybody in need of protection will not have access to this system, is either to try to deceive Canadian people or to demonstrate that they have not read the Bill. It is either a deliberate attempt to deceive or to show that they have not read the Bill.

An inquiry starts with the need to determine whether or not persons are admissible to Canada. If their desire to be admitted to this country is on the basis that they are Convention refugees, they say it; that is the reason; they have counsel; and the hearing must be adjourned until the refugee board is brought into the hearing. That is universal access. Anybody who claims to be a Convention refugee has his or her case dealt with by a refugee board member.

There are conditions of eligibility. If the Hon. Member from the New Democratic Party who just spoke had been in committee and had heard the witnesses whom the committee brought from New York to tell us about world-wide conditions and American conditions, he would have seen the piece of paper, which is an exhibit before the committee, that laid out the legal situation for anybody in the United States of America whom the Government of that country was trying to send back to his or her country of origin.

Those of us on the committee who are familiar with the current Canadian condition reached the conclusion that the American condition might even be more complex, longer lasting, with more loopholes for a clever lawyer to exploit. It is not an easy thing to remove somebody from the United States of America.

They have had a Charter of Rights for a lot longer than this country has had, embedded in their Constitution. They have legal processes. They are at least of the kind of quality which exists in our mosaic. Their Charter requires it, their system of government requires it, and people have it.

To stand in this Chamber time after time and say that the only country in the world which gives these rights, these protections, these legal safeguards, to refugee claimants is Canada is nonsense. People should spend a little more time at organizations like the United Nations to see what other countries do—to see what Scandinavian countries do and to see what France does.

France is viewed world-wide as a country with, in many ways, the best protection for refugees. It takes people whom I am sure this Parliament and this country would not want.

They took Duvalier from Haiti. I am sure there would have been quite an outcry in this Chamber and this country if we had tried to bring Duvalier here.

The Hon. Member for La Prairie seemed to be bothered by my remarks the other day. He and I were in discord in the month of May. I was in discord with members of the committee about some things on which I felt I was right and on which committee members were wrong. Committee members voted to uphold the point of view expressed by the Hon. Member for La Prairie, and I resigned the chairmanship of the committee so that I could speak in this Chamber as an individual on things that I believe in.

• (1620)

I believe the Member from La Prairie inside and outside of the Chamber comes dangerously close to expressing his personal opinions as if they were the opinions of the committee. I think a careful examination of the opinions of committee members would reveal that they are not, that, in the majority, members on the standing committee are clearly supportive of Bill C-55 because it is designed to get the job done.

We are dealing with Motions No. 27, 29 and 34. Motion No. 27 suggested by the Hon. Member for Spadina would create the following situation if Members were to approve it. No departure notice or removal order can be issued in this country without a refugee board member and an adjudicator. The removal of that clause would encourage everybody who had been given a deportation order to disappear for a few hours, days or weeks. In other words, do not obey the removal order. All of a sudden a person would have the right of re-entry into the refugee system. Is that what we want? These people would have been through an inquiry and an actual determination hearing if there was credibility to their claims. Simply by disappearing upon the issuance of a removal order a person would have the right of re-entry. That is what Motion No. 27 is all about. I suggest that we should defeat it and defeat it resoundingly.

Let us go now to Motion No. 29. There is a slight practical problem with the suggestion that we eliminate the words which the Member requests. Actually quite a few lines are involved. Thirty-seven million visitors come into this country annually. In the absence of these words we would be saying to our civil servants, when people destroy all their documentation, papers, airline tickets and everything else, that they, the civil servants, will have an obligation to prove where the people came from. The situation is absurd. People do not come without tickets, and to prove where they came from they simply have to submit their ticket. If people choose to destroy their tickets, are these the refugees about whom we are concerned or are they bogus claimants, people who are trying to abuse our generosity? The words must stay as they are. We cannot transfer the obligation to trace the history of 37 million visitors a year to a few civil servants at border points.